P11

C.F. 71.

19 36

Department of RD

OFFICE CD Madras

STATION Madras

No. No. 1865

Dated 2-6-36

DES[illegible]D
6 JUN 1936

(SUBJECT.)

Allowances Dasdik (Sanctioned) Karaikudi Madras Salary Grade Cadre — Payment for Fasli 1342 & 1343 — Collector of Madras Sanctioned

BOARD OF REVENUE
16 JAN 1936
GENERAL

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

Revenue department.

A270

YSEC'y
16 JAN 1936

Allowances - Taddik - (South Kanara) Karkal taluk - Veera Jahardhana Dev - Payment of arrears - Govindaraya Kedlaya Petition. From M.R.Ry.Govindaraya Kedlaya petition dated 18th December 1935.

Endorsement No. 5198 B / 35-1, dated 10th January 1936.

Referred to the Board of Revenue for early report showing the facts of the case and the exact nature of the allowance in questi It should be reported in particular whether the Inam Commissioner dealt with this allowance at the Inam Settlement and issued a title deed in respect of it. A copy of the Collector's order of .1930 referred to in the petition should also be submitted together with information as to whether the inam (if it was an ~~maiir~~ inam) was resumed the Collector on the ground of cessation of service.

P.K.Ganansundaram Mudaliyar.
Assistant Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue with the petition in original to be returned.

....

F o r w a r d e d

(By order)

P Krishnan 15/1/36.
Superintendent.

jn.

Office copy.

To

The Secretary,
Government Revenue department,
Madras.

Appeal petition of H. Govindraya Kedlaya, Managing trustee of Yellare Janardhan Temple Karkal taluk.

Sir,

This appeal is against the order of the Board of Revenue in B.P. Routine No. 6011 dated 10-11-1935.

The appellant begs to submit as follows:-

1. That the appellant is the managing Moktessor of Yellare Janardhana Devaru which has a taadik of Rs.220-0-0 -- assigned from certain holdings in Bellampalli village in Udipi taluk.

2. That in the year 1930 the Collector ordered that the tasdik should be held in deposit by collecting it from pattadars in view of the fact that the Tahsildar reported that the institution was in disreapirs and services were not conducted regularly. But the Revenue Department instead of sending the tasdik to deposit reimposed assessment and merged the tasdik into general Revenues.

3. That ever since the Hindu Religious Endowments Board had settled a scheme of administration for the Temple . the appellant has been seeing to proper conduct of the pujahs and also to the repairs of the Temple. The sanctum Sanctorum & Mandapams are in good Condition The appellant has spent large sums of money out of his pocket for thr improvement of the Temple. This fact is well known to the officers of the Hindu Religious Endowments Board.

4. That in April 1936 the appellant applied to the Collector requesting him to pay all arrears of tadik supposed to have been held in deposit as it would have helped the appellant to carry on his work of rebuilding the Temple and also help him to conduct the various viniyogas connected with the Temple. The appellant believes that as th

~~the~~

the tasdik was an assignment of Revenue , the Revenue department has no right to collect it from the pattadar. The Tahsildar held a personal inspection but the appellant was surprised to find that sanction to pay tasdik of only 1344 was accorded which he believes was done with the sanction of the Board of Revenue. The appellant's appeal to the Board of Revenue in this connection was dismissed. Hence this second appeal.

5. In the meanwhile a notice was served on the appellant asking him to pay contribution to the Hindu Religious Endowments Board upto fasli 1341. The appellant represented to the Endowments Board that the demand was exorbitant. The matter has not yet been settled in the Endowments Board upto fasli 1341 should be drawn as a refund from land Revenue collections and ~~a~~ paid to it In the matter of further contribution levied by the Endowments Board in respect of subsequent faslis, it is understood that the endowments Board has requested the Collector to suspend collections until my petition is settled.

6 . The appellant understands that th collector has ordered that tasdik for fasli 1344 sanctioned to be paid should in the first instance be refunded to the Wargadars from whom it was collected and from whom it has to be obtained ~~by~~ for the appellant. This itself would show that the Revenue Department should not have collected the tasdik from pattadar and put the appellant to such a lot of trouble. The tasdik for ~~1343x1344~~ 1344 has not yet been paid to the wargadars. The appellant is therefore unable to collect the amount.

7. The appellnt finally submits that in view of the fact that services has been conducted all along as would be borne out by Taluk records and the fact that he has been spending large sums of money to put the institution in order hoping to get the tasdik wrongly collected from the pattadar, the Government would be pleased after a proper enquiry to order the payment of tasdik wrongly withheld. The officers of the Endowments Board are quite aware of the pains taken by the appellant to improve the condition of the institution to whom a reference may be made if thought fit.

The appellant prays that justice may be done to him.

Enclosure:- Proceedings of the Board ofRevenue dated 20-11-3

Dated 18-12-1935 H. Govindraya Kddl
Managing Trustee.

Revenue 11 DEPARTMENT. C.F. 98

270
A22

REMINDER. _____ *Branch.* **REPLY.**

BOARD OF REVENUE
13 MAR 1936
MADRAS

To THE Board of Revenue

To THE

13 MAR 19..

The undersigned ~~has the honour to invite~~ is directed to invite attention to the communication noted in the margin and to request that ~~this reminder may be returned at once with information as to~~ reply may be expedite

~~(1) the stage at which the matter now is,~~

~~(2) the date by which a reply may be expected, and~~

~~(3) the circumstances which have caused the delay.~~

~~2. It is requested that the reply to this reminder may be sent not later than~~

End No. 519813/35-1, dated 10.1.36

To A Colln)

Rlw

14326

Office Revsect.

Signature.

Station Fort St George

Asst. Secretary to Govt.

Designation.

Dated 11-3-36

Received 13/3/36

SUBJECT. Allowances - Dasari - (Sarkaryana) Kovvuri Taluk - Vellore Janardhana Rao - Payment of arrears - Petition from Mr Gurindavaza Kedaya

C.F. 16.

DRAFT FOR APPROVAL.

Date. Initials.

When received for air copying

When copied

When examined

When signed

When despatched. DESPATCHED 27 JAN 1936

SUBJECT:— Allowances: Taxidi (Smt Nanaya) Married to Village Accountant Dec. Payments towards Kodaya Deliveries

READ AGAIN Pop 2415 dtd, dated 2.3.35 & 19

" " Pop 6011 Rev " 20.11.35 & 19

READ ALSO:—

No. From the A 270/36-1, No. A within encls dated 19

" " " " " 19

" " " " " 19

Order / Resolution Ms. / Rout. No., dated 19

Refee. A 270.36.1 of 24/36.

Forwarded to the Collector of South Kanara for report on all the points raised in the Govt. Endt. read above.

2 The connected records of the case should also be submitted

To the Collector of South Kanara with encls. & reto with reply PP 3-8-36

13

R. O. C. 545-36-B-1.



South Kanara Collector's Office,
Mangalore, dated 22nd April 1936.

From

Khan Bahadur Muhammad Humayun, Sahib Bahadur, B.A.
Collector of South Kanara.

To

The Secretary to the
Board of Revenue,
Madras.

Sir,

Allowances-- Tasdik--South Kanara--Karkal Taluk--Yellare Janardhana Dev--Payment of arrears to Govindaraya Kedilaya--Petition to Government.

Board's reference A. No. 270/36-1 dated 24th January 1936.

I resubmit the petition of Govindaraya Kedilaya received with the Board's reference. I also enclose Collector's D. Dis. file 11941-30 dated 15th December 1930.

2. The Tasdik allowance due to the Yellare Janardhan Dev of Karkal Taluk of which petitioner is the managing trustee, is in the nature of an assignment of revenue of Rs.220/- from Muli warg No. 1 of Bellampalli village Udipi Taluk and is covered by title deed No. 525 according to the entries in the Inam Register of Udipi Taluk. It appears as item 324 at page 47 of the list of money allowances communicated with G. O. 2065 Revenue dated 9th October 1929. The Hindu Religious Endowments Board is levying a contribution of Rs.60/- per annum from this institution.

3. The facts of this case were reported to the Board in Collector's letter R.O.C. 1611-35-B-1 dated 13th June 1935 and the Board ordered in its proceedings Mis. 2415 dated 2nd July

fasli 1344. Petitioner claimed the allowance for faslis 1342 and 1343 also and appealed to the Board; but the appeal was dismissed in Board's Proceedings Routine 6011 dated 20th November 1935.

4. The petitioner Govindaraya Kedilaya became the managing moktessor or trustee of the institution under a scheme of administration which was drawn up in 1934 by the Hindu Religious Endowments Board for the management of the Institution. He was not the Trustee in 1930 when the Tahsildar of Udipi brought to the notice of the Collector that the building of the institution was out of repairs (since 1922) and that services were not being regularly performed and that in spite of a notice issued by the Tahsildar, the trustee had failed to set matters right. It was on receipt of this report that the Collector (Mr. Wells) ordered (on 15.12.30) that a notice should be issued to the trustee giving him one year's time to repair the building and to ensure the regular performance of services and that in the meanwhile, pending a further consideration, the full assessment should be collected from the registered holder of Muli warg No. 1 of Bellampalli and that the amount of Tasdik should be kept in deposit. A copy of this order enclosed.

5. Mr. Wells appears, as stated in paragraph 3 of Collector's letter dated 13th June 1935 to have passed this order, without any intention of having the tasdik merged in the L. R. collections of Bellampalli. He ordered that it should be kept in deposit as a separate item. On the strength of the order passed by him, however the item relating to the institution was eliminated from the remission statement of Bellampalli village and the assessment was added to the Land Revenue Demand, at the Jamabandy of the Udipi Taluk for fasli 1340.

6. The institution continued in disrepair even up to the end of 1934 and the trustee did not take any steps to obtain the tasdik. The Hindu Religious Endowments Board however sent in 1933 a requisition for the collection of the contribution due to it from the temple for the period up to and including fasli 1341 and Rs.432-8 were paid to it out of the amounts due to the temple for faslis 1340

and 1341 by refund of Land Revenue and by adjustment to the credit of the Hindu Religious Endowments Board. When a further requisition was again received from the Hindu Religious Endowments Board in 1934 for the collection of Rs.120/as contribution for faslis 1342 and 1343, the petitioner who had then become the trustee represented that the income of the temple had been grossly over estimated by the Hindu Religious Endowments Board. He requested that the coercive measures which were in progress might be dropped and that the amount due to the Hindu Religious Endowments Board might be paid by adjustment out of the tasdik amount due for 1342. The Collector (Mr. Cawne) however refused to pay the amount due to the Hindu Religious Endowments Board under the requisition of 1934 as the Hindu Religious Endowments Board had failed to do anything to put the temple in repair and was seeking only to deprive the temple of the tasdik which might be utilised for its repairs. The amount due to the temple for faslis 1342 and 1343 has therefore not been disbursed and it is merged in the L. R. collections for these faslis of Bellampalli village.

7. Early in 1935, the petitioner seems to have set about commencing repairs to the institution and the Tahsildar reported in May 1935/after inspection that services were being regularly performed and that the building had been sufficiently repaired. It was this report that the Collector addressed the Board on 13th June 1935. On receipt of B.P. Mis. 2415 dated 2nd July 1935, the order of 1930/was cancelled by the Collector and the petitioner has, as ordered by the Board, received(on 10th February 1936) the tasdik due to the temple for fasli 1344. The amount due to the institution every year appears now in the accounts again as an assignment of land revenue in favour of the temple.

8. The question that remains for consideration is whether in view of the fact that the tasdik was merged by mistake in land revenue by the order of 1930, the temple is not now entitled to the tasdik due to it for faslis 1342 and 1343. As services are now reported to have been conducted --

all along properly, though the buildings were not in good condition up to 1934, I recommend that the Government may be moved to order the payment of the allowance due to the temple for faslis 1342 and 1343 as a refund of revenue.

Your obedient servant,

For Collector.

23.4.26.

Revenue

BOARD OF REVENUE DEPARTMENT
15 MAY 1936
Branch

C.F. 98.

8pl **REMINDER.**

To The Board of Revenue

REPLY.

To The

I ~~have the honour to invite~~ am directed to invite attention to your end No. 5798 B/35-1 dated 10.1.36 and

~~to request that the reply to it may be expedited~~ request that this reminder may be returned ~~at once~~ before 29.5.36 with information as to—

(1) the stage at which the matter now is and

(2) the date by which a reply may be expected, ~~and~~

(3) ~~the circumstances which have caused the delay.~~

Office Revenue

Station Fort St. George

Dated 13.5.36

Signature. Asst. Secretary to Govt. Rev. Dept.

Designation.

SUBJECT.

Allowances - Jasdih - (Santhanara) Karkal Taluk - Yellare Jamardhana Dev - Payment of arrears - Petition from Govindaraya Kedlaya.

16/ A 27036

A 2133

16/5

A(Rev)

2 do A(Rev)

Filed

2 the Board's reply dispatched on 14.5.36 - vide p. 17 Cb.

Re 12.5.36

dg 18/5

36 18/5

WW 18/5/36

Sectt. 11-15 (a)—35,000—15-11-35.

Received 1- JUN 1936 193

Registered SECY. 1-JUN 1936 19

Abstract.

ALLOWANCES -

Tasdik - (South Kanara) - Yellare Janardhana Dev -

Payment of arrears for faslis 1342 and 1343 - Sanctioned.

REVENUE DEPARTMENT.

G.O.No. Ms. 1197, **dated** 30th May **1936.**

READ the following paper:—

ENCLOSURES.
No.

From Govindaraya Kedliya, petition, dated 18th Dec.1935.
Endt. to the Board of Revenue, No.5198-B/35-1, dated 10th January 1936.
From the --do-- Ref.No.A.270/36-2, dated 12th May 1936.

O R D E R

The Government accept the recommendation of the Board of Revenue that the allowance of Rs.220/- per annum due to the Yellare Janardhana Dev, Karkal taluk, South Kanara district, for the two faslis 1342 and 1343 should be paid to the present trustee, M.R.Ry. Govindaraya Kedliya.

(By Order of the Governor in Council)

H.R. UZIELLI,
Secretary to Government.

To the Board of Revenue.
To the Accountant-General thro' the Finance Deptt.
Copy to M.R.Ry. Govindaraya Kedliya, Bairampalle village, Udipi Taluk, Perdur Post, through the Board of Revenue.

FORWARDED.
(By Order).

Superintendent.

v.s.v. 30-5.

Note file

Allowances Basdit (Servi
Devasom) Dharmal Ex. yellase
Janardhana Dev Paymaster
arrears Petition - Trustee
P.C. A270/36

To A.S

Please see the Govt. Endt
at P.C. on DD's letter at P. 9 C to
Coll's reply thereto at pp 13-16

2. The Coll's reply is full
and deals with the facts of the
case.

3 The petitioner who is the
Trustee of the Temple sought for
the payment of the allowance
for fasles 1342 & 1343. The
Board did not sanction the
payment of these allowan
as it was on record that the
temple buildings were in
disrepair till the end of 19
vide Notes & orders in the
at (V) & (X) of Para 03(1). ii
of B.S.O no. 67. Though
Collector is aware of this
yet he recommends the
payments of the basdik for fasli 1342 & 1343 as it is
now reported that services were all along conducted properly though
the buildings were in disrepair till 1934. The Collector's

N.3

A(Jr)

with incomplete regns.
at (a) & (b)

for Dept. Hqrs
SW

pp 3-5 C

Encls:- P 2 (U)
P 22 (X)

P. 444 of B.S.O Vol II

Paras 8 at P. 16 C

P 16 C

... is a special case.
... income is in real allowance
... is 220/-.

4. The D.C. issued the T.D.
No. 525 of 26-11-1875 in
favour of Kumarai Ballala-
Manager for the time being
of the pagoda of Yellare
Janardana Deva, bearing
a Tasdik amount of Rs. 220.

Is the Tasdik for the upkeep of the institution or for the performance of service
The Bd's order in (X) is based on the presumption that it is for the former.
WW 25.3.36

p.4 IV.7 of (K)

p.5 IV.7 of (L)

WW 30/4/36 CD 1/5/36.

To AD(dn2)

Please see the ASST Secy's Query in the margin & the discussions in Apps Nos 25(K)/61 mis dt 18.9.334 676(L) mis dt 27.2.34. Tasdik allowances are money grants given for services to be rendered in or to a religious institution

It is not clear from the records whether the tasdik (money allowance) was for

DS 55 WW 5/5/36

temple or for the performance of service in it? Presumably it was for both, for service can not be rendered in a temple satisfactorily if the temple be not in repair.

In the present case the temple has been ~~just~~ repaired and the service continued. The money allowance withheld in Paris 1342 & 1343 has, it seems, to be paid now, as recommended by the Collr.

It may be paid to the present trustee as he carried out the repairs, though he is ~~xxx~~ not the person that rendered service in F. 1342, for it appears difficult to apportion the allowance between the upkeep of the temple & the performance of the service in it.

orders whether recommendation may be made to Govt: on the above lines

W
6.5.36

20 AD (Cdre)

Draft Govt

9/5
9.5.36
12.5.36

W
11/5/36 W 14/5/36.